

C1

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE

425 Eye Street N.W.

BCIS, AAO, 20 MASS, 3/F

Washington, D.C. 20536

File: [REDACTED] Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date: SEP - 2 2003

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

[REDACTED]

Petition: Petition for Special Immigrant Religious Worker Pursuant to Section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), as described at Section 101(a)(27)(C) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

[REDACTED]

**PUBLIC COPY**

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id.*

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Cindy N. Gomez for  
Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director of the Vermont Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner identifies itself as a Seventh Day Adventist church. It seeks classification of the beneficiary as a special immigrant religious worker pursuant to section 203(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(4), to perform services as an ordained elder. The director's decision states only that the petitioner failed to establish that the beneficiary had been continuously serving in a qualifying religious occupation during the two-year period immediately preceding the filing date of the petition.

On appeal, counsel indicated that a brief would be submitted within 30 days of the filing date of the appeal. As of this date, no brief or further documentation has been received.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v):

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

In this case, counsel fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal. As the petitioner has provided no additional evidence on appeal to overcome the basis for denial of the petition, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

It is noted that the following, additional grounds of ineligibility were not addressed in the director's decision:

1. The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary has received a qualifying job offer.
2. The petitioner has not demonstrated that the offered position constitutes a qualifying religious occupation for the purpose of special immigrant classification.

As the appeal will be summarily dismissed, however, these issues will not be addressed in this decision.

Counsel requests oral argument. Oral argument, however, is limited to cases where cause is shown. It must be shown that a case involves facts or issues of law which cannot be adequately addressed in writing. In this case, no cause for oral argument is shown. Consequently, counsel's request for oral argument is denied.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proof remains entirely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, that burden has not been met. In accordance with 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v), the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.